UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

————————

No. 03-7298

————————

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

                                            Plaintiff - Appellee,

        versus

MYRON WAYNE CAYTON, JR., a/k/a Ron,

                                            Defendant - Appellant.

————————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Robert G. Doumar, Senior
District Judge. (CR-00-47-4; CA-02-84-4)

————————

Submitted: February 12, 2004   Decided: February 20, 2004

————————

Before LUTTIG, WILLIAMS, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

————————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

————————

Myron Wayne Cayton, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Janet S. Reincke,
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Newport News, Virginia, for
Appellee.

————————

PER CURIAM:

Myron Wayne Cayton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) and the district court's order denying reconsideration. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Cayton has not made the requisite showing.

Accordingly, we deny Cayton a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED